

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed August 9, 2007. No claims are amended and new claim 40 is added. Claims 1-40 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicants remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Applicants respectfully note that the remarks herein do not constitute, nor are they intended to be, an exhaustive enumeration of the patentable distinctions between any cited references and the invention, example embodiments of which are set forth in the claims of this application. Rather, and in consideration of the fact that various factors make it impractical to enumerate all the patentable distinctions between the invention and the cited art, as well as the fact that the Applicants have broad discretion in terms of the identification and consideration of the base(s) upon which the claims distinguish over the cited references, the distinctions identified and discussed herein are presented solely by way of example. Consistent with the foregoing, the discussion herein is not intended, and should not be construed, to prejudice or foreclose contemporaneous or future consideration by the Applicants, in this case or any other, of: additional or alternative distinctions between the invention and the cited references; and/or, the merits of additional or alternative arguments.

Consistent with the points set forth above, Applicants submit that neither the claim amendments set forth herein, nor any other claim amendments or statements advanced by the Applicants in this or any related case, constitute or should be construed as, an implicit or explicit surrender or disclaimer of claim scope with respect to the cited, or any other, references.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 8-10, 12, 13, 23-26, and 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,385,669 to *Creedon et al.* ("*Creedon*"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 1, 23, and 28, although of different scope, each recite, among other things:

an act of monitoring the data wire of the two-wire interface upon determining that the operation is to be performed on the slave component;

an act of detecting at least a predetermined number of consecutive bits of the same binary polarity have occurred on the data wire during the act of monitoring the data wire; and

an act of asserting a frame of the two-wire interface on the data wire in response to the act of detecting that the predetermined number of consecutive bits of the same polarity have occurred on the data wire.

The Examiner identified a preamble in Figure 4 of *Creedon* as corresponding to the claimed “predetermined number of consecutive bits of the same binary polarity.” *See Office Action*, p. 2 (citing *Creedon* at col. 4, lines 62-67). The preamble is part of a frame generated by entity 10 (*see Creedon*, col. 4, lines 58-62), which the Examiner identified as a master component (*see Office Action*, p. 2). Figure 4 of *Creedon* is copied below for the Examiner’s reference.

FIG. 4

PREAMBLE	ST	OP	PHYADDR	REGADDR	TA	DATA
----------	----	----	---------	---------	----	------

Further with respect to entity 10 (identified as the “master component”), the Examiner asserted that “the master is able to read the data wire at any time and therefore reads on the ‘act of monitoring and detecting at least the predetermined sequence of bits.’” *See Office Action*, p. 8. However, coupled with the Examiner’s identification of the preamble as the claimed “predetermined number of consecutive bits,” this assertion implies that the “master” of *Creedon* monitors and detects its own preamble. This unusual arrangement is not described anywhere in *Creedon*.

Furthermore, the Examiner asserted that "Creedon states 'the next portion of the frame format is a start of frame ST' (Column 5, Line 7), which reads on the 'act of asserting a frame of a two-wire interface on the data wire.'" See *Office Action*, p. 8. However, the claimed "act of asserting a frame of the two-wire interface on the data wire" is done "in response to the act of detecting that the predetermined number of consecutive bits of the same polarity have occurred on the data wire." (Emphasis added.) In contrast, the ST portion of the frame format in *Creedon* is described as "[t]he next portion of the frame format" following the preamble pattern, unrelated to any act of detecting bits on a data wire. See *Creedon*, col. 5, line 7.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to establish that *Creedon* anticipates claim 1, claim 23, or claim 28, at least because the Examiner has not established that each and every element as set forth in the claims is found in *Creedon*, and because the Examiner has not established that the identical invention is shown in *Creedon* in as complete detail as is contained in the claims. Applicants thus respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 23, and 28, and corresponding dependent claims 2-5, 8-10, 12, 13, 24-26, 29, and 30, should be withdrawn.

B. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 11, 14-22, and 31-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Creedon* in view of what is purportedly "well known in the art."

Applicants respectfully submit that insofar as the rejection of claims 6, 7, 11, 14-22, and 31-39 relies on the unsupported assertions regarding the disclosure of *Creedon* advanced by the Examiner in connection with the rejection of claims 1, 23, and 28, such rejection lacks an adequate foundation, for at least the reasons outlined at section II.A above, and should accordingly be withdrawn.

III. New Claim 40

Applicants note new claim 40 has been added herein. Because claim 40 depends from claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 40 is allowable at least because claim 1 is allowable, as discussed in section II.A above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 10th day of December, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ronald J. Ward/Reg. No. 54,870

RONALD J. WARD

Registration No. 54,870

ERIC L. MASCHOFF

Registration No. 36,596

Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800